

**Remarks/Arguments**

Claims 1, 3-6 are pending. The claims have been amended to more clearly and distinctly claim the subject matter that applicant regards as his invention. Claim 1 has been amended to recite, inter alia, "... first and second processing pathways having respective first and second descrambling modules ..." and "... first and second processing pathways comprising respective first and second management means for driving the conversions of the first and second scrambled signals via selected ones of the first and second descrambling modules..." Support for the amendment is provided in, for example, page 7, line 13 - page 8, line 4. No new matter is believed to be added by the present amendment.

**Rejection of claims 1 and 3-6 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gurantz (US Pat No 5936660) in view of Ushiyama (US Pat No 6349140)**

Applicant submits that for at least the reasons discussed below amended claims 1 and 3-6 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

The present application relates to a device having first and second processing pathways, each having first and second descrambling modules, for descrambling first and second scrambled signals, each processing pathway comprising respective first and second management means for driving the conversion of the first and second scrambled signals (see page 3, lines 5-16). In that regard, amended claim 1 recites:

*- first and second processing pathways **having respective first and second descrambling modules** able to undertake the conversion of the first and second scrambled signals into first and second descrambled signals ...  
the first and second processing pathways comprising **respective first and second management means for driving the conversions of the first and second scrambled signals via selected ones of the first and second descrambling modules...** (emphasis added)*

Applicant submits that nowhere does either reference teach or suggest the above emphasized features of amended claim 1.

The Office Action acknowledges that Gurantz "... does not explicitly disclose 'the at least two processing pathways comprising first and second management means for driving the conversion of the first and second scrambled signals, and in that first management means is arranged to communicate with the access control module to activate the conversion of the first scrambled signals, and the second management means is arranged to communicate with the access control module by way of the first management means to activate the conversion of the second scrambled signals.'" Applicant submits that not only does Gurantz, explicitly or implicitly, fail to teach or suggest the above noted limitation of previous claim 1, but also fails to teach or suggest the above-mentioned limitation of amended claim 1.

Applicant submits that Ushiyama fails to cure the defect of Gurantz as applied to claim 1. Ushiyama teaches a system that includes subscriber terminals that operate in a parent/child relationship. According to Ushiyama, **only the parent subscriber terminal** provides the descrambling function, and the center only controls parent subscriber terminals that have the descrambling function. See for example, col. 4, lines 16-23 "According to the present invention, since **the parent subscriber terminal unit 1 descrambles scrambled information and outputs the descrambled information to the child subscriber terminal unit 2**, the child subscriber terminal unit 2 is not required to have the descrambling function, thereby simplifying the construction of the child subscriber terminal unit 2." (emphasis added). See also, col. 4, lines 43-48, and lines 23-39. Although either the parent or child subscriber terminal may be capable of **requesting** channels, only the parent subscriber terminal includes the descrambling function. Therefore, applicant submits that Ushiyama also fails to teach or suggest the above-mentioned limitation of amended claim 1.

In view of the above, applicant submits that the suggested combination of Gurantz and Ushiyama fail to teach or suggest each and every limitation of amended claim 1, and as such, amended claim 1, and claims 3-6, which depend therefrom, are patentably distinguishable over the suggested combination.

CUSTOMER NO.: 24498  
Ser. No. 09/980,503  
Final Office Action dated: Oct. 17, 2005  
Response dated: Feb. 13, 2006


PATENT  
SCP061774

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's attorney at (609) 734-6815, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

Respectfully submitted,

Jean-Philippe Borel

By:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Paul P. Kiel  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 40,677  
(609) 734-6815

PPK:pdf

Thomson Licensing Inc.  
Patent Operations  
P.O. Box 5312  
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

February 13, 2006